

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 30, 45, 47, 49, and 51 have been amended and claims 1-65 remain in the case. This amendment does not raise new issues, since it merely copies or paraphrases into the body of each of claim 1, 30, 45, 47, 49, and 51 the recitation that was previously presented to the Examiner in the respective claim's preamble.

In the Advisory Office action of October 27, 2005, the Examiner enunciated Points (A), (B), and (C). The Applicants respectfully point out that each of the stated Points (A), (B), and (C) is factually in error, and that based on those factual errors, the Applicant's claims have been rejected.

**A. Point (A) of the Advisory Office Action:**

In the Advisory Office action of October 27, 2005, the Examiner's Point (A) reads as follows:

Point (A), In response to the applicants; remarks, the recitation of "distributing a user-defined name of a user's wireless device to a plurality of member wireless devices in an ad hoc network" (see Applicant's remarks on pages 2, 4) has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble."

In response, the Applicants respectfully point out that independent claim 21, which was previously before the Examiner as of the response of October 5, 2005, did in fact have the claim element "distributing a name distribution message ..." recited in the body of claim 21.

By the above amendment to the remaining independent claims 1, 30, 45, 47, 49, and 51, the claim element of "distributing a name distribution message ..." or similar language that was in the respective claim's preamble, has been copied into the body of the respective claim. This amendment does not raise new issues, since it merely copies or paraphrases the same recitations that were previously present in the respective preambles. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the amended claims 1, 30, 45, 47, 49, and 51, along with claim 21 that

was previously before the Examiner.

**B. Point (B) of the Advisory Office Action:**

In the Advisory Office action of October 27, 2005, the Examiner's Point (B) reads as follows:

Point (B), Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

In response, the Applicants respectfully point out that the arguments presented in their response of October 5, 2005 to the Examiner did in fact specifically point out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the Flanagin and Adbelaziz references. The Applicant's remarks in their response of October 5, 2005 read, in part, as follows:

[1] The Flanagin reference does not disclose distributing a user-defined name of a user's wireless device to a plurality of member wireless devices in an ad hoc network, as claimed by the Applicant.

[2] Moreover, Flanagin's operation of searching for matches of device names is the opposite of comparing names to automatically resolve any name conflict, as claimed by the Applicants. In Applicant's claimed invention, a user-defined name that matches with another member device name in the ad hoc network results in automatically substituting an alternate name for the user-defined name. Thus, the disclosure in Flanagin teaches away from the Applicant's claimed invention.

[3] The Adbelaziz reference also does not disclose distributing a user-defined name of a user's wireless device to a plurality of member wireless devices, as claimed by the Applicant.

[4] Moreover, Adbelaziz's operation of searching for devices is the opposite of comparing names to automatically resolve any name conflict, as claimed by the Applicants. In Applicant's claimed invention, a user-defined name that matches with another member device name in the ad hoc network results in automatically substituting an alternate name for the user-defined name. Thus, the disclosure in Adbelaziz teaches away from the Applicant's claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the remarks in their

response of October 5, 2005, which do in fact specifically point out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the Flanagin and Adbelaziz references. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the amended claims 1, 30, 45, 47, 49, and 51, along with claim 21, in light of these remarks.

**C. Point (C) of the Advisory Office Action:**

In the Advisory Office action of October 27, 2005, the Examiner's Point (C) reads as follows:

Point ( C), In response to the applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

In response, the Applicants respectfully point out that the arguments presented in their response of October 5, 2005 to the Examiner did in fact discuss and distinguish their claims from the combination of the Flanagin and Adbelaziz references. The Applicant's remarks in their response of October 5, 2005 read, in part, as follows:

The combination of Flanagin and Adbelaziz fails to disclose or suggest the Applicant's invention claimed in claims 1-65. The combination of Flanagin and Adbelaziz reference does not disclose or suggest distributing a user-defined name of a user's wireless device to a plurality of member wireless devices in an ad hoc network, as claimed by the Applicant. Moreover, in Applicant's claimed invention, a user-defined name that matches with another member device name in the ad hoc network results in automatically substituting an alternate name for the user-defined name. The combination of Flanagin and Adbelaziz teaches away from the Applicants' claimed invention since Flanagin and Adbelaziz search for matching device names to make a connection, which is the opposite of the Applicant's claimed comparing names to automatically resolve a name conflict by substituting alternates when the names match. The disclosures in the combination of Flanagin and Adbelaziz teach away from the Applicants' claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the remarks in their response of October 5, 2005, which do in fact specifically discuss and distinguish their claims from the combination of the Flanagin and Adbelaziz references. The Applicants respectfully

request the Examiner to reconsider the amended claims 1, 30, 45, 47, 49, and 51, along with claim 21, in light of these remarks.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of all of the claims now in the case and allowance of the application.

### **AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4004. A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: November 7, 2005

By: 

John E. Hoel  
Registration No. 26,279  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

### **Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101